

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Members Present

Albert Chen, Ben Rousseau, Bryce Magorian, Celestina DiMauro, Daniel Eisenbeis, Everett Wild, Howie Oakes, Joe Gillock, Liz Start, Matthew Bibeau, Rebecca Hayes, Sara Busickio, Stephan Lashbrook

Members Not Able to Attend

Jessica Neu, Neil Hankerson, Stacy Johnson

City of Milwaukee

Mark Gamba, Mayor; Councilor Lisa Batey
Kim Travis and Greg Hemer; Planning Commission
David Levitan, Denny Egner, and Mary Heberling; Planning Department
Peter Passarelli; Public Works Director
Natalie Rogers; Climate and Sustainability Coordinator

EnviroIssues

Emma Sagor

Angelo Planning Group

Matt Hastie

Conversation and questions/answers are summarized by agenda item below. Raw flipchart notes are attached as an appendix to this summary (Appendix A, respectively).

WELCOME

- Mayor Gamba: Thanked CPAC members who could make Town Hall meeting. Tonight we'll go over all of the town hall comments, survey comments, and pull all of this information together. Staff will lead us in doing that for tonight's meeting.
- Emma Sagor– Introduced Natalie Rogers, new climate and sustainability coordinator for the City to CPAC members and went over the agenda for the night.
- David Levitan – Went over upcoming Comp Plan schedule for the rest of Block 2.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FINDINGS

- Emma – Went over community engagement findings
 - Lisa Batey – Why are there 214 unique online users, but only 62 people responded to survey?
 - Emma – Average time spent on the survey was around 4 minutes, which is high, but the low percentage of engagement could be because people realized it was the same from the town hall, survey fatigue and didn't answer all questions. Could work on getting this number higher next time.
 - Lisa – Were there any technical issues with the survey?

- David – We had a few days on the website that had some issues, but didn't receive many comments on technical issues.
 - Celestina – Think we should be getting info about views to AND from. Info we got is confusing.
- **Comments about Town Hall**
 - Celestina – Heard from community member that they felt it was inappropriate to have Spanish-speakers at their own table. Should be integrated with other tables.
 - Emma – I heard that comment as well, might have been from the same person.
 - Liz Start– I urge you to take this with a grain of salt. There is some privilege in that comment.
 - Stephan Lashbrook – I liked the format, but heard from my wife that she did not like having switch tables during the middle of the town hall. Felt that it lost the momentum of what the group had been discussing.
 - Ben – Agree with that comment.
 - Rebecca – Did find some people that didn't want to move at my table.
 - Lisa – I found that people enjoyed the switch as well though.

GROUP DISCUSSION ON WORKSHOP POLICY DISCUSSION

- **Parks and Recreation**
 - Natalie Rogers – Preserve green spaces for wildlife and plans and their connectivity. How human connectivity can also protect habitat.
 - David – Parks may be able to provide solar and green energy where other development may be limited.
 - Daniel Eisenbeis – Worth looking at using green development to help with waste water and the waste water treatment plant.
 - David – In Olympia, waste water treatment plant had lots of educational opportunities for kids.
 - Lisa – The facility at Vancouver WA one has educational opportunities too.
 - Ben – Solar covered year-round farmers market space. Olympia also has a year-round farmers market.
 - Lisa – Where's the threshold to where we are requiring open space in new development? Need to think about that.
 - Mayor Gamba – We have large swaths of land used as parking lots. Should we have a policy around what the conversion of those parking lots should look like with autonomous vehicles being the main form of transportation? Should those areas be dedicated to future parks? Should we start talking about that now in the Comp Plan?
 - Daniel – That seems like an issue that would be more related to applications to redevelop any partially vacant site. Development or redevelopment of sites at certain size may dictate requirement of parks.
- **Natural Hazards**
 - Lisa – Did people answer if we should have a natural hazards overlay zone?
 - Matt Hastie – Without having more information about how that and other specific strategies associated with shifting development from areas with hazards to areas without them, our group had a hard time deciding what is best way to do that and collect the right information on how to create that overlay zone.
 - Matt – CPAC needs more information and up to date maps on how to best make decisions on specific policies around hazards, particularly

those that relate to shifting development from areas with hazards to areas without them.

- Ben – Would like more information on density transfers and how it could impact residents of Milwaukie.

- **Climate/Energy**

- Celestina – We didn't talk much about incentivizing renovations of existing properties. Would like to see more of that.
 - Liz – Could also look in History, Arts & Culture chapter. Think we had some of that in that chapter.

HOUSING POLICY TRACK

- David – Encouraged CPAC members to come to Dec. 6th Housing Forum. Following Tuesday Dec. 11th, joint meeting with PC and CC to debrief and start talking about housing policy.
 - Also talked about housing being a sub-committee versus requiring all CPAC members to attend two meetings a month.

CLOSED MEETING – Lisa provided closing remarks and that the updates to Milwaukie Bay Park next meeting is Nov. 15th, 6-8pm.

APPENDIX A: SUMMARIZED FLIP CHART NOTES

Q: How do we ensure alignment with our vision?

Parks and Rec

- Vision speaks directly to MBP

Hazards and Climate Change

- Alignment between plans is important
- Vision Action Plan may be the vehicle for shorter term actions

Q: Are the recommendations moving in the right direction?

Parks and Rec

- Parks and Rec zone → Yes!
- Goal around transportation and connectivity → build on SAFE
 - Especially around access to waterfront
- SDCs → flexibility; rather than requiring park space, use SDC funds
- Consider barriers to getting to parks

Hazards

- Yes, generally right direction
- Organizing by broader goals (clean energy too) → yes
- Generally, use “shall” more
 - Where do we get specificity to make sure “shall” happens?
- Reducing development in high risk/incentivize development in low risk → YES

Greenway

- More restrictions closer to river; less further from the river
- Rec amenities specific to Greenway → Yes!
- Capping WWTP → could be cool, but \$\$
 - Integrate site with habitat protection

Energy and Climate Change

- Need to ensure these are adhered to
- Outreach, education, and awareness is key
- Apply Sustainability and Equity lens
- Green building and incentivizing upgrades → yes
 - Look at HAC policies

Q: Remaining questions?

Parks and Rec

- Green energy and parks
 - Echoed in CC/energy group
- Consider habitat connectivity and balance with human paths
 - Regional habitat connectivity WG
- Should we be requiring more open space/parks in new development?
- Bake in policy now around conversion of parking lots
 - Redevelopment of sites of a certain size?

Greenway

- Educational programs along water → what kind of access we're providing
- E.g. education near Olympia WWTP

Hazards

- Need more info on where to go with dev allowances in risk zones
 - Undecided on hazard overlay zone
 - Maps and data
 - Pull from other agencies
 - **Need at next meeting**
- What metrics should we be using/incorporating?
- CAP actions → Comp Plan

Energy and Climate Change

- Should some policies have priority over others? (e.g. trees v. density; design v. affordability)
- Want more info on density transfer and financial implications → how it works

Implementation Action Parking Lot

- Solar covered farmer's market space
- Uses allowed in parks once we develop the park zone